



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/454,875	12/03/1999	NACERDINE AZZI	RCA-89342	4350

7590                    02/20/2003

JOSEPH S TRIPOLI  
PATENT OPERATIONS  
THOMSON MULTIMEDIA LICENSING INC  
CN 5312  
PRINCETON, NJ 08540

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

ZIMMERMAN, GLENN

[REDACTED] ART UNIT

[REDACTED] PAPER NUMBER

2879

DATE MAILED: 02/20/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/454,875	AZZI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Glenn Zimmerman	2879	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on November 25, 2002.

2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 5-7 and 22 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 5,6 and 22 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 7 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 03 December 1999 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Response to Amendment***

Response, filed on November 25, 2002, has been entered and acknowledged by the examiner.

The substitute specification, filed on November 25, 2002, has been entered and acknowledged by the examiner.

***Priority***

Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in France on 12/11/1998. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the 98 15645 application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

***Drawings***

The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference sign(s) not mentioned in the description: 42. A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Koba et al. U.S. Patent 4,975,618.

Regarding claim 22, Koba et al. disclose a deflection yoke (**deflection unit Fig. 9 ref. 27**) for a cathode-ray tube (**color picture tube ref. 21**) comprising:

A pair of horizontal deflection coils (**saddle type horizontal deflection coils ref. 27**) and a pair of vertical deflection coils (**pair of vertical deflection coils ref. 30**) for generating magnetic deflection fields perpendicular to a main axis of the cathode-ray tube, one of the pairs including saddle-shaped coils having conducting wires arranged so as to form a front conductor assembly (**separator ref. 31; col. 4 lines 36-39**) and a rear conductor assembly (**separator ref. 31; col. 4 lines 36-39**) coupled to each other by lateral conductor bundles (**Figure 7 and 8 no ref. #**), and those parts of each of the coils which form the rear conductor assembly and the lateral bundles being arranged approximately symmetrically with respect to a plane (**Fig. 7 and 8**); and

A first metal plate (**metal plate Fig. 9 ref. 34**) placed near the front conductor assembly for locally modifying one of the direction and the amplitude of the magnetic field created by the current flow in the front conductor assembly so that, considering a

first zone of the front conductor assembly and a second zone symmetrical with the first zone with respect to the plane, the fields created in the first and second zones are asymmetrical (**Fig. 10**) with respect to the plane. The previous limitations are inherently satisfied. Plate can mean a very thin applied or deposited coat of metal.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 22, 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hatte French Patent Application Publication 2034201 in view of Barkow et al. U.S. Patent 3,721,930.

Regarding claim 22, Hatte teaches a deflection yoke (**deflection coil ref. 2**) for a cathode-ray tube (**page 2 paragraph 5**) a first metal plate (**a thin slug of divided iron ref. 3 or thin layer of a suitable magnetic material powdered iron or ferrite**) placed near the front conductor assembly (**ref. A shows that the thin slug can be placed longitudinal to the neck and near the front conductor assembly**) for locally modifying one of the direction and the amplitude of the magnetic field created by the current flow in the front conductor assembly so that considering a first zone of the front

conductor assembly and a second zone symmetrical with the first zone with respect to the plane, the fields created in the first and second zone symmetrical with the first zone with respect to the plane, the fields created in the first and second zones are asymmetrical with respect to the plane (**the slug can be placed anywhere along ref. B for transverse motion, which would create asymmetry relative to the zones**), but fail to teach a pair of horizontal deflection coils and a pair of vertical deflection coils for generating magnetic deflection fields perpendicular to a main axis of the cathode-ray tube, one of the pairs including saddle-shaped coils having conducting wires arranged so as to form a front conductor assembly and a rear conductor assembly coupled to each other by lateral conductor bundles, and those parts of each of the coils which form the rear conductor assembly and the lateral bundles being arranged approximately symmetrically with respect to a plane. Barkow et al. in the analogous art teach a pair of horizontal deflection coils (**col. 2 lines 36-40**) and a pair of vertical deflection coils (**col. 2 lines 36-40**) for generating magnetic deflection fields perpendicular to a main axis of the cathode-ray tube, one of the pairs including saddle-shaped coils (**col. 2 lines 36-40**) having conducting wires arranged so as to form a front conductor assembly (**transverse conductor ref. 37**) and a rear conductor assembly (**transverse end turns ref. 38**) coupled to each other by lateral conductor bundles (**side conductors ref. 36**), and those parts of each of the coils which form the rear conductor assembly and the lateral bundles being arranged approximately symmetrically with respect to a plane (**Fig. 7**).

Consequently it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a pair of horizontal deflection coils and a

pair of vertical deflection coils for generating magnetic deflection fields perpendicular to a main axis of the cathode-ray tube, one of the pairs including saddle-shaped coils having conducting wires arranged so as to form a front conductor assembly and a rear conductor assembly coupled to each other by lateral conductor bundles, and those parts of each of the coils which form the rear conductor assembly and the lateral bundles being arranged approximately symmetrically with respect to a plane in the Yoke of Hatte, since such a modification would be conventional.

Regarding claim 5, Hatte teaches all the limitations of claim 5, but fails to teach wherein the saddle-shaped coils are the vertical deflection coils. Barkow et al. in the analogous art teach wherein the saddle-shaped coils are the vertical deflection coils.

Consequently it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use vertical saddle-shaped coils in the deflection coil of Hatte, since such a modification would be conventional.

Referring to claim 6, Hatte teach all of the limitations of the claim. Hatte teaches a deflection yoke according to claim 22, wherein the first metal plate extends, in a plane perpendicular to the z axis about a mean radial direction of between 60 degrees and 90 degrees measured with respect to the direction of the plane of separation of the two coils of the same pair. Ref. B (**page 2 paragraph 7**) shows that the first metal plate can be moved traversely from 0 to 180 degrees, so the mean radial direction of Hatte covers between 60 and 90 degrees.

***R sponse to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 22, 5 and 6 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claim 7 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Regarding claim 7, the following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The prior art of record neither shows nor suggests a deflection yoke according to claim 22 including the combination of all the limitations as set forth in claim 7, and specifically further comprising a second metal plate wherein the first and second metal plate extend on both of the saddle-shaped coils of the same pair, symmetrically with respect to the Z axis could not be found elsewhere in prior art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Glenn Zimmerman whose telephone number is (703) 308-8991. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimesh Patel can be reached on (703) 305-4794. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7382 for regular communications and (703) 308-7382 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2879

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is n/a.



Glenn Zimmerman  
February 12, 2003



ASHOK PATEL  
PRIMARY EXAMINER